

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. Claims 2-3, 69-74 and 76 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

As per claim 2, lines 15-16 and claim 3, line 38, the antecedent basis for “said maintenance communication means” recited therein has not been set forth in these claims. Further, on line 37 of claim 3, the antecedent basis for “said maintenance advisory” also has not been set forth and should be changed to “said maintenance advisories” to rectify the problem.

As per claim 69, line 1, the dependency is unclear since there is no claim 645.

As per claim 72, line 2, the phrase “configured to transmit digital data on said communication network” is technically unclear. Is it meant “configured to transmit digital data to said communication network”? Further, is the “digital data” to be transmitted on line 2 directed to the “digital performance data” recited in the parent claim 64? If so, “said digital performance data” should be recited. Similarly, “digital data” on line 5 also should be changed to “said digital performance data”. Finally, on line 3, the antecedent basis for “said receiver” has not been set forth in the claim.

As per claim 74, line 2, the antecedent basis for “said aircraft performance and control parameters” also has not been established.

As per claim 76, line 2, the phrase “configured to transmit data on said communication network” should be “configured to transmit said data to said communication network” for the same reason as set forth above with regard to claim 72. Further, “data” on line 5 and

Art Unit: 3661

“maintenance advice” on line 8 should be “said data” and “said maintenance advice” respectively in order to avoid the antecedent basis problem.

Claims that have not been specifically indicated are rejected for incorporating the above errors from their respective parent claims by dependency.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-3, 64, 69-74 and 78-79 are again rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith et al (patent no. 5931877) in view of Kuroda et al (patent no. 5381140).

As per claims 1-3, 64, 69-74 and 78-79, the reason for the rejection based upon the combined teachings of Smith et al and Kuroda et al as set forth in the last office action dated 4/16/04 is maintained and incorporated herein by reference.

4. Claims 66-68 and 75-77 are again rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith et al and Kuroda et al and further in view of Monroe (patent no. 5798458).

As per claims 66-68 and 75-77, the reason for the rejection based upon the combined teachings of Smith et al, Kuroda et al and Monroe as set forth in the last office action dated 4/16/04 is also maintained and incorporated herein by reference.

5. Claims 92, 93 and 95 are again rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuroda et al in view of Monroe.

Art Unit: 3661

As per claims 92-93 and 95, the reason for the rejection based upon the combined teachings of Kuroda et al and Monroe as set forth in the last office action dated 4/16/04 is also maintained and incorporated herein by reference.

6. In the "remarks" section of the amendment filed on 3/2/05, applicant essentially alleged that (1) the transmission of a configuration label along with the aircraft performance and control parameters as required in claims 1-3 has not been disclosed in neither the Smith et al reference nor the Kuroda et al reference, (2) the transmission or communication of the performance and control data while in-flight as required in claims 64 and 66-79 has not been disclosed in the Smith et al reference and (3) the storage as disclosed in Kuroda et al only provides storage for data necessary to predict a theoretical path of the aircraft and there is no disclosure therein of archival (long term storage) of performance and control data as required in claims 92-93 and 95.

7. In response, the examiner strongly disagrees with such allegations. As to allegation (1), although the aircraft configuration label has not been explicitly disclosed in the Smith et al or Kuroda et al reference, however, it would have been readily apparent for one skilled in the art that the transmitted aircraft ID data to the ground station in Kuroda et al is implicitly included the configuration label as claimed since the aircraft configuration label can be directly determined based upon the aircraft ID. Further, one skilled in the art would have recognized that the maintenance advisory generated in the Smith et al system must include the aircraft configuration in conjunction with other transmitted data in order to provide accurate maintenance advisories to a correct aircraft. As to allegation (2), although the feature of transmitting the performance and control data to the central ground station while the aircraft is in-flight has not been explicitly disclosed in the Smith et al reference, however, such feature of transmitting

Art Unit: 3661

aircraft data to the ground station while in-flight is notoriously well known and clearly taught in figure 1 (also see column 3, lines 65 to column 4, lines 1-3) of the Kuroda et al reference. Hence, it is the examiner's contention that it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art that the real-time advisory as taught in Smith et al either already been using the in-flight data or would have been obvious to do so based upon the direct teaching found in the Kuroda et al reference. As to allegation (3) that there is no disclosure in Kuroda et al of long term storage or archival of performance and control data necessary for a crash data recorder, the examiner also disagrees with such allegation. As disclosed in figure 1 and columns 3-4 of the Kuroda et al reference, performance and control data from navigation device and the ADS airborne device (see column 1, lines 53-60) are being recorded in the storage device within the monitoring device while the aircraft is in-flight. Since there is no disclosure in the Kuroda et al reference as to the deletion of such data stored in the storage device, it would have been readily apparent to one skilled in the art that in the event of a crash, the stored crashed data such as aircraft position, velocity, course, wind and temperature (see col. 1, lines 53-60) can be readily retrieved and as such meets the limitations of a crash data recorder as claimed.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gary Chin whose telephone number is (571) 272-6959. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:00 AM to 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas G. Black can be reached on (571) 272-6956. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3661

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



GARY CHIN
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.